Thursday 31st October 2019

Manchester Airport: Future Airspace Research – Workshops

[redacted] – Director, Head of Qualitative Research
[redacted] – Senior Research Executive, Qualitative Research

YouGov®

Report structure:

Background, sample and method

Background, aims and objectives

- Manchester Airport is one of the UKs major international gateways and a key contributor to the regional and national economy. As part of Government proposals to modernise the way UK airspace is managed, Manchester Airport will soon be undertaking an extensive process of engagement and consultation with stakeholders and local communities. Over the course of the next few years Manchester Airport will bring together NATS, the CAA and other airports to shape the airspace design on which it will formally consult (likely in 2020). Before this, it will be important to speak to individuals, organisations and groups that have an interest in the airspace around Manchester Airport to provide feedback on principles that will be used to redesign the airspace, as part of the overall programme.

- The research will seek to capture feedback from a range of interested parties to ensure that Manchester Airport has a clear understanding of the views of all its major stakeholder groups, and that the design principles that emerge are properly understood and fit for purpose. This will set the foundations of the future airspace work.

- The key aims and objectives of the research are to:
  - Ensure that Manchester Airport have complied fully with the requirements of the CAAs CAP1616 process regarding engagement in Stage 1B.
  - Ensure that Manchester Airport has a strong understanding of the views of its stakeholder groups, to inform the subsequent stages of design and development.
  - Ensure that the design principles that emerge are properly understood, are consistent with the statement of need, support operational requirements, and allow Manchester Airport to continue to grow safely and efficiently.
  - And, ensure that the design principles that emerge are checked and validated with stakeholders from the focus groups with a proper understanding of the associated impacts, via a second phase of workshops.

Sample and method

- YouGov conducted 4 x 2.5 hour workshops with key stakeholder groups, identified by Manchester Airport. Workshops took place between 21st – 24th October. The stakeholder group specification is outlined below.

General Public

- All living close to Manchester Airport, mix of those currently overflown / not overflown
- **19** x respondents

Care / Business / Community reps

- All working in healthcare, care or charities
- Or representatives of local community
- Or in regional / local business / development organisations
- **12** x respondents

Special Interest / Leisure

- All members of regional special interest groups
- Or members of regional leisure groups
- **15** x respondents

Elected reps / Aviation

- All members of district, local and parish councils
- Or directly affected on- / off- airport stakeholders
- **13** x respondents

Draft Design Principles review

Ten draft Design Principles were shown to stakeholders

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 1

All routes must be safe, and must comply with industry standards and regulations.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 2

Any change must accord with the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and any variation to it.
Any current or future plans associated with the airspace change must also allow connection to the wider UK En-Route network and be aligned with the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for the North (FASI-N) programme and take into consideration the needs of neighbouring airports.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 3

Manchester Airport's future airspace must make best use of the capacity of its existing runways, in line with government policy.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 4

Where practical, demonstrable noise and emissions benefits should be shared amongst residential areas. The use of dispersion and/or respite, especially at night, should be used to achieve this.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 5

Where there is a demonstrable opportunity to minimise, and where possible reduce, emissions by designing the most direct routes, this will be considered.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 6

Any changes should prioritise airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 7

Designs should minimise the impact of our operation on other airspace users through keeping Controlled Airspace (CAS) requirements to a minimum

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 8

Airspace designs should be based on the latest aircraft navigational technology widely available

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 9

Where practical, airspace designs should avoid flying over noise sensitive areas, such as historical attractions, tranquil or rural areas, sites of care or education.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 10

Designs should seek to minimise, and where possible, reduce, the effect of noise from flights upon people.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 1

All routes must be safe, and must comply with industry standards and regulations.

Design Principle 1 is clear and understood: safety is fundamental for air travel, so the inclusion of this principle makes sense

- **Overall, this is seen as an obvious (and important) inclusion**
  - For most, this is an obvious inclusion – safety is paramount, and it should be at the core of any redesign – though some feel it's simply 'a given'
  - It's seen as benchmarking a minimum level of safety, to ensure that routes are 'safe, if not safer' than before
  - The need to comply with industry standards / regulations is understood, and many expect this to have a positive impact on safety
- **The implications of this are broadly understood**
  - Most can understand the positive implications for passengers / aviation
  - However, some struggle with this in regards to increasing capacity – with more aircraft flying there's a greater perception of risk
  - Some Aviation reps also question how this would impact GA traffic, would 'safety' also apply to GA traffic movements?
- **However, there are some questions about the finer details**
  - Some call out the use of 'safety' in this context, as it means different things to different people, so this could be clarified
  - Many also ask for more details on the industry standards and regulations

Draft Design Principle 1

"All routes must be safe, and must comply with industry standards and regulations."

All can understand the inclusion of a safety principle, and they agree that this reflects earlier conversations

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

All – across stakeholder groups – can understand the inclusion of this principle. Safety is seen as fundamental for air travel, and they expect safety (and compliance with industry standards and regulations) to underpin any future changes.

Draft Design Principle 1

"All routes must be safe, and must comply with industry standards and regulations."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

Stakeholders agree that the safety principle reflects earlier conversations on the 'Meeting Requirements' question, where safety was seen as a 'given', and compliance to industry standards / regulations as mandatory.

Small clarifications, and changes to language would fine-tune Design Principle 1

Clarification / extra information

- There are calls for ‘safety’ to be clarified, as it means different things to different people – is this safety for passengers, those on the ground, or commercial and GA aircraft?
- Many want to know more about the industry standards – are they current or are they new ones, devised through the programme?
- Individuals also call for details on how this will be regulated, and who is accountable for safety.

Changes to language

- Language generally works well, as it’s clear and simple, but small changes are required:
- **‘Demonstrably’** safe would strengthen the phrase and add reassurance
- Adding ‘**good practice**’ to the end of the sentence, may help to reinforce the statement.

“Can’t argue with that! Safety is paramount.” **General Public**	*“Good practice and common sense.”* **Community / Care / Business**	*“Common sense. But what are industry standards and regulations?”* **General Public**
“Should say ‘demonstrably safe’ – what standards?” **Elected reps / Aviation**	*“Goes without saying.”* **General Public**	*“Safe for all users of the sky.”* **Elected reps / Aviation**
“This is expected, and necessary.” **Special Interest / Leisure**	*“This must be paramount and a priority for any change or development.”* **Community / Care / Business**	*“They should exceed industry standards, setting the tone for the future.”* **Special Interest / Leisure**

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 2

Any change must accord with the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and any variation to it.
Any current or future plans associated with the airspace change must also allow connection to the wider UK En-Route network and be aligned with the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for the North (FASI-N) programme and take into consideration the needs of neighbouring airports.

Most see Design Principle 2 as complex and complicated but they do see the rationale for its inclusion

- **It's a sensible inclusion, but hard to comprehend**
  - For most, this is seen as a logical addition to the design principles
  - This is seen as a 'once in a generation' opportunity for change, and so it needs to be done properly, in coordination with other bodies
  - However, many struggle with the language and technical content, which can make it hard to comprehend
- **The implications of this are understood**
  - Most can understand the positive implications for MAN and passengers – it's a more standardised, and efficient approach
  - While they can understand the importance of linking between different airports, there are questions as to how this would work in practice
  - Some question whether specific airports would hold more sway – would MAN have more of a say in the process as a large international airport?
- **However, many ask for clarification on key points**
  - For most, language needs to be clarified, as it's too complex
  - There are also some calls for details of the FASI-N airports (which airports does this include), for reference.

Draft Design Principle 2

"Any change must accord with the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and any variation to it. Any current or future plans associated with the airspace change must also allow connection to the wider UK En-Route network and be aligned with the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for the North (FASI-N) programme and take into consideration the needs of neighbouring airports."

Stakeholders understand the reasons for including this Design Principle, and can see how it reflects earlier conversations

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

Stakeholders can understand the rationale for including this design principle. The need to join up air space is key (especially given the overlap with neighbouring airports), and it's changes under 7,000ft must fit with those above 7,000ft, so it's a logical step.

Draft Design Principle 2

"Any change must accord with the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and any variation to it. Any current or future plans associated with the airspace change must also allow connection to the wider UK En-Route network and be aligned with the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for the North (FASI-N) programme and take into consideration the needs of neighbouring airports."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

Again, stakeholders feel that this principle fits with earlier conversations, particularly around ensuring that any changes made by MAN must fit into the changes made by NATS. This was referenced in Meeting requirements question, and in wider conversation.

Small changes to language, and to the information shown, would help to fine-tune Design Principle 2

Clarification / extra information

- Technical terms and the tone make the principle difficult to digest, so commentary / explanation is key in aiding understanding.
- Individuals question whether MAN will have to compromise on designs, based on the plans put in place by other airports.
- Some also ask how the airports will work together, given conflicting commercial priorities, and want clarity around which airports are regarded as ‘neighboring’.

Changes to language

- Language is felt to be complex, and while commentary will be provided, it can be simplified:
- Many call for a greater use of **plain English** here to cut through
- **‘Take into consideration**’ neighbouring airports seems woolly – stronger language is required.

“Could be in simpler language or contain an example.”
General Public

“I think it’s important they all work together.”
Community / Care / Business

“Integration of the systems needs to be 100% Presumably airports will negotiate with each other?”
General Public

“This seems to make sense – what will the consequences be?”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Better inter-connections and standardisation.”
General Public

“Hard to disagree with.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“How do airports negotiate with one another?”
Special Interest / Leisure

“I would have expected that anyway. It’s not a suggestion but it’s something I thought they’d do anyway. They need to make sure it fits in with local airports.”
Community / Care / Business

“Need plain English – it’s too technical.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 3

Manchester Airport's future airspace must make best use of the capacity of its existing runways, in line with government policy.

Design Principle 3 – 'making best use of capacity' – is understood, and most can understand its inclusion

- **Most can understand the rationale for this principle**
  - All agree that making the most of existing runway capacity makes sense
  - Across stakeholder groups, making better use of runways is far preferable to building a 3rd runway to increase capacity
  - All recognise the importance of including this, in light of government policy
- **Stakeholders broadly understand the implications**
  - While they understand the rationale behind it, some question the impact this will have on the local community, esp. in regards to night flights
  - Individuals also ask about the operating capacity of other airports, and whether the demand for increased flights will be shared across UK airports
- **There are questions about some of the details**
  - Many ask what 'capacity' means in this context – the potential for more flights is unappealing, while an increase in throughput (i.e. the same number of flights leaving more quickly) is more appealing
  - There are also some comments around the infrastructure on the ground needing to mirror that in the air, in terms of terminal buildings / access to MAN

Draft Design Principle 3

"Manchester Airport's future airspace must make best use of the capacity of its existing runways, in line with government policy."

While runway capacity itself didn't feature in earlier conversations, they do understand why this principle is included

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

Stakeholders can understand the rationale for including this design principle. Making best use of MANs runways is seen as a logical step for all (esp. when they learn that current capacity is c. 50%), and it's preferable to building a 3rd runway.

Draft Design Principle 3

"Manchester Airport's future airspace must make best use of the capacity of its existing runways, in line with government policy."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

While capacity of existing runways was not discussed explicitly in the earlier stages of the research, there were broader discussions around the runways and how these are used, and so it's not a surprise to see this included.

There's scope for extra information, and small changes to language to fine-tune Design Principle 3

Clarification / extra information

- There are calls for clarification around the term 'capacity': some see this as more aircraft while others see this as increased throughput.
- Many want to know more about government policy – how current is it, and will it change?
- Some also want to know what 'best use' means here – is this 100%? Some are concerned at what this will look like for people on the ground.

Changes to language

- Language / tone works well in this principle, with just minor calls for change:
- **'Best use'** needs to be clarified / defined in order to cut through effectively.

“We don’t know what the target for extra utilisation is or what that would look like.”
General Public

“Need to work with what they’ve already got but don’t lose sight of noise and emissions.”
Community / Care / Business

“What’s the alternative – an airport the size of Manchester doesn’t need another runway so it seems a non-statement.”
General Public

“What is best use? What is maximum capacity?”
Elected reps / Aviation

“What is ‘best use’?”
General Public

“Must not be at any cost to the local community.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“This is better than more runways.”
Special Interest / Leisure

“It says make best use of the capacity of the existing runways. What’s the maximum it can be? What are we talking about?”
Community / Care / Business

“Would be useful to compare runway capacity with other airports.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 4

Where practical, demonstrable noise and emissions benefits should be shared amongst residential areas. The use of dispersion and/or respite, especially at night, should be used to achieve this.

With both noise and emissions raised as key concerns in the earlier focus groups, Design Principle 4 is welcomed

- **Stakeholders see this as an important inclusion**
  - Noise and emissions are key challenges for stakeholders, and all agree that design principles must address these
  - While noise is immediately impactful, emissions are a long-term concern, and so both need to be addressed
  - For those affected by night flights at present, the reference to respite at night is essential (though it's less important for those not affected)
- **However, there are some questions about the implications**
  - Some feel that this is contradictory, as spreading routes will result in more emissions, which is at odds with the core of the principle
  - Individuals also note that benefits to noise reduction won't always correlate with emissions reductions
- **There are also some questions about the specifics**
  - The use of the word 'benefits' is broadly seen as a challenge – most struggle to align sharing noise and emissions as beneficial
  - There are also questions as to how realistic this will be – how much flexibility will there be for dispersion under 7,000ft?
  - Individuals also ask for more information on what the periods of respite will be

Draft Design Principle 4

"Where practical, demonstrable noise and emissions benefits should be shared amongst residential areas. The use of dispersion and/or respite, especially at night, should be used to achieve this."

All can understand why this principle has been created, and agree that it reflects earlier conversations

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

Stakeholders can understand the rationale for including this design principle. Noise is a key concern for many (esp. those living closes to MAN), and emissions is considered to be a significant challenge. Many are positive about the inclusion of this principle as a result.

Draft Design Principle 4

"Where practical, demonstrable noise and emissions benefits should be shared amongst residential areas. The use of dispersion and/or respite, especially at night, should be used to achieve this."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

Stakeholders agree that this reflects earlier conversations regarding noise (esp. at night), and emissions which were both raised across all focus groups. The reference to dispersion reflects conversations in the focus groups around 'sharing the burden' amongst residents.

Simplifying the language, and adding clarification at key points, will hone the principle further

Clarification / extra information

- Some are keen to know how realistic this will be, and how much flexibility there is under 7,000ft.
- There are also comments about the inclusion of ‘where practical’ – this isn’t strong enough for most, and it provides MAN a ‘get out clause’.
- A number of respondents ask for this to be separated into 2 points, as the principle covers a lot of information as it stands.

Changes to language

- Language generally works well, though there are areas for clarification:
- Most struggle to understand **‘benefits’** in this context – **‘impacts’** seems more appropriate
- Some also question the use of **‘respite’**, as it suggests that outside of this, noise could be intolerable.

“Sharing the impacts seems most fair – if volumes increase it should be spread more.”
General Public

“’Impact not ‘benefits’.”
Community / Care / Business

“Night time disruption must be kept to a minimum.”
General Public

“Agree that night flights must be reduced / kept to a minimum.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Talking about ‘benefits’ is disingenuous – should refer to ‘changes’.”
General Public

“Night flights are a very important issue – sharing is a good principle for the rest of the time.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Where practical? Should this not be as important as safety?”
Special Interest / Leisure

“If one area is at the moment getting say 100 over flights per day, and that’s perhaps reduced to 90. How much of a benefit will they perceive it to be, the people underneath it?”
Community / Care / Business

“Shared benefit makes it sound too positive.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 5

Where there is a demonstrable opportunity to minimise, and where possible reduce, emissions by designing the most direct routes, this will be considered.

Design Principle 5 is understood – reducing emissions is a key concern for stakeholders, so the inclusion of this principle makes sense

- **This is broadly felt to be an important principle**
  - With the environment / climate change a prevalent topic in the media, addressing emissions is key
  - Air travel emissions are seen as a contributor to the environmental challenge, so stakeholders are pleased to see this being considered
  - For many (bar those most severely affected) this is more of a concern than noise, however, they recognise the difficult trade-off between the two
- **The implications of this are understood**
  - They can understand the value in using the most direct routes, if this provides an opportunity to minimise / reduce emissions
  - However, some are unsure how this will fit with overall increased capacity – will this counteract any of the reduction benefits stated?
- **However, some questions emerge on the content**
  - There are calls for more information around emissions – a definition, and also current emissions figures, and how these would be reduced
  - Some question the language used, which is felt to be softer than earlier: 'opportunity' and 'considered' aren't strong enough.

Draft Design Principle 5

"Where there is a demonstrable opportunity to minimise, and where possible reduce, emissions by designing the most direct routes, this will be considered."

With emissions such an important topic in the focus groups, all can understand why this design principle has been included

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

All can see the rationale for this design principle – with emissions such a big news story – it's a key priority. Those with aviation knowledge comment that techniques also come into this – for example, using continuous climb and descent to limit impact.

Draft Design Principle 5

"Where there is a demonstrable opportunity to minimise, and where possible reduce, emissions by designing the most direct routes, this will be considered."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

With emissions such a core topic in the earlier focus groups, all can see how this fits into earlier conversations. Many recognise the impact that the air traffic has on emissions, and are pleased that this is a consideration in redesign.

There are calls for language to be tightened up / honed, to make it a stronger proposition

Clarification / extra information

- Many ask for ‘emissions’ to be qualified – most expect this to be CO2 – but they don’t know if this relates to emissions in the air, or to local air quality on the ground.
- Some call for more information on what the current emissions impact is, for reference.
- Some note the potential conflict between Principle 4 and 5, which must be acknowledged.

Changes to language

- Language generally works well, though some feel that it could be stronger:
- **‘Will be considered’** isn’t as concrete a comment as all would like – more affirmative action would be welcomed.
- **‘Where possible’** again seems non-committal, so stronger language is desired.

“Considered amongst what? What would trump it? This makes it feel unimportant.”
General Public

“Very good – but how big is the impact?”
Community / Care / Business

“Noise can’t impact my health, emissions can reduce my life expectancy – emissions are to do with safety – paramount.”
General Public

“Emissions is an impact for a greater number of people than noise.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Less emissions per flight but collectively more [as more flights].”
General Public

“Yes, but the balance – the trade-off with noise?”
Elected reps / Aviation

“’Considered’ – I don’t like this word.”
Special Interest / Leisure

“There is a conflict between noise and emissions.”
Community / Care / Business

“I think reducing emissions should be first priority.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 6

Any changes should prioritise airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft

Respondents agree that emergency aircraft take priority, and see Design Principle 6 as an obvious inclusion

- **On the whole, this fits with their own prioritisation of airspace users**
  - This principle is widely supported across stakeholder groups
  - Stakeholders see it as a common sense decision, to the point where the principle feels unnecessary to some
  - Many agree that airport air traffic users are the priority, due to the commercial benefits they bring – though emergency aircraft are the exception to the rule
- **Many are happy to retain the status quo here**
  - This is seen as a continuation of how airspace is already managed, requiring little change – current procedures work, so it makes sense to keep them
  - However some, particularly Aviation stakeholders, question the extent to which other airspace users have been considered in this principle
- **But there are some questions on the specifics**
  - Many ask what constitutes ‘emergency; in this context, with some pointing out that emergency aircraft could also relate to aircraft in distress – clarification of what is included would be welcomed

Draft Design Principle 6

“Any changes should prioritise airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft.”

Principle 6 clearly reflects conversations had previously – emergency aircraft take priority

Is this a logical addition? Does it make sense

The thinking behind this principle is clear – it fits with current practices, and ensures emergency aircraft are able to mobilise as necessary. All agree that emergency aircraft should take precedence over other GA aircraft.

Draft Design Principle 6

"Any changes should prioritise airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

Stakeholders can clearly see the link between earlier conversations and this principle – they are clear that there is a need to ensure emergency aircraft can operate uninhibited and recall this from Question 6.

While the principle is clear on the whole, more information around the aircraft included would be welcome

Clarification / extra information

- Emergency aircraft is assumed to mean air ambulance and military aircraft, however clarification would be welcome – for example, does this include aircraft in distress?
- Individuals ask how many aircraft this would mean at MAN, for context.
- Aviation also representatives ask for ‘other airspace users’ to be clarified here for reference.

Changes to language

- Language here generally works well, however some changes are requested:
- The statement of intent could be stronger here – using **‘would’** not **‘should**’ would reassure.
- A definition of **‘other airspace users’** would be a welcome addition.

"100% commercial aviation must be the priority." **General Public**	*"Agree the majority of emergency aircraft should take priority over commercial flights."* **Community / Care / Business**	*"No brainer...a waste of a principle."* **General Public**
"Inevitable but proper consideration should be given to others." **Elected reps / Aviation**	*"Not controversial, but need to mitigate impact on other users"* **General Public**	*"Keep it as is."* **Elected reps / Aviation**
"Remember this from last time – I'm happy with the principle." **Special Interest / Leisure**	*"Yes. I wouldn't necessarily like to see the CAS actually getting any bigger, but within that space which has been allocated to the airport for their use, then yes [commercial] should be prioritised."* **Community / Care / Business**	*"This seems to go without saying."* **Special Interest / Leisure**

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 7

Designs should minimise the impact of our operation on other airspace users through keeping Controlled Airspace (CAS) requirements to a minimum

Design Principle 7 seems a sensible compromise to most stakeholder groups

- **Most say other airspace users should be considered, to an extent**
  - Respondents feel this principle demonstrates a ‘good community ethos’
  - While commercial flights should take priority, the needs of other airspace users should not be ignored
  - Unsurprisingly, some Aviation stakeholders are pleased to see this included – however others would like to see GA called out specifically here
- **Respondents want clarity around the safety implications**
  - It is broadly agreed that this could mean safer airspace, as more space for GA means less need to fly close to CAS and the larger aircraft which use it
  - However, a minority are concerned that changes to routes could be a challenge to safety, and need reassurance that this would not be the case
- **For laymen, it is difficult to conceptualise what this really means**
  - Some want to know how many other airspace users will be affected by this and to what extent
  - A minority question whether the principle is needed, if the impact on other airspace users is low – it could be appropriate to integrate this into Principle 6, rather than having it as a stand-alone.

Draft Design Principle 7

“Designs should minimise the impact of our operation on other airspace users through keeping Controlled Airspace (CAS) requirements to a minimum.”

Principle 7 combines beliefs about priority with concerns for other airspace users, expressed earlier in Stage 1B

Is this a logical addition? Does it make sense

There is a consensus that this principle makes logical sense – it demonstrates consideration for other airspace users, while continuing to support MANs commercial operations. This is particularly appreciated by Aviation stakeholders.

Draft Design Principle 7

"Designs should minimise the impact of our operation on other airspace users through keeping Controlled Airspace (CAS) requirements to a minimum."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

This principle is felt to reflect the priority given to MAN air traffic in earlier conversations, whilst also taking account of concerns raised by some around disadvantaging other air users – especially those expressed by Aviation stakeholders.

An explanation of controlled airspace is needed to clarify the impact of this principle

Clarification / extra information

- For some, reassurance is needed that other airspace users will be engaged with meaningfully in order to assess impact.
- Some call for more information on the number of other airspace users affected.
- A minority also want reassurance around what this principle means for safety.

Changes to language

- Language is relatively clear, although some changes are required:
- While Aviation representatives are clear on what '**controlled airspace'** is, other groups need this to be explained.
- Some would also like to see stronger language here – **'minimise impact'** and **'to a minimum'** can seem non-committal.

“Don’t want to needlessly restrict other users, but this is lower priority.”
General Public

“Agree that, where possible, impact on other aircraft should be kept to a minimum.”
Community / Care / Business

“I presume these types of flights would be a very low percentage.”
General Public

“Agree – and this can be done by understanding each others requirements.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Don’t really understand the impact of this.”
General Public

“Tension between those affected in terms of the number of people concerned…”
Elected reps / Aviation

“A very specific definition of CAS is needed.”
Special Interest / Leisure

“There’s very much a sense of etiquette and mutual respect.”
Community / Care / Business

“A good community ethos.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 8

Airspace designs should be based on the latest aircraft navigational technology widely available

Design Principle 8 fits with respondents' understanding of the Airspace Modernisation Programme

- **Across groups, stakeholders broadly support this principle**
  - It seems a logical step in terms of modernising and future-proofing the airspace in anticipation of further updates to technology
  - The redesign is seen as a once in a generation opportunity, so it makes sense to be as forward-thinking as possible
  - However, some question whether airlines will challenge this change if updating technology comes at a high cost and suggest they may need 'encouragement'
- **Most can understand the implications of this**
  - Respondents see potential benefits of new technology, in terms of reduced noise and reduced emissions
  - There may also be commercial benefit here if it means more direct routes can be flown, closer together
- **However, there are some questions**
  - Some want to understand how smaller airlines and other users will be affected by this (e.g. what are the cost implications)
  - Others also want clarity on the timeline for implementation – some want further clarification on what is meant by 'phasing' and what it would look like in reality for the aircraft affected.

Draft Design Principle 8

"Airspace designs should be based on the latest aircraft navigational technology widely available."

It is clear that Design Principle 8 has been developed from focus group conversations

Is this a logical addition? Does it make sense

This principle is clear and makes sense across groups – a majority agree that this is a natural step and air travel should be kept as up to date as possible. The use of the latest technology will play a key role.

Draft Design Principle 8

"Airspace designs should be based on the latest aircraft navigational technology widely available."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

This principle clearly reflects earlier conversations around the use of new technology, and many also feel this aligns well with the core principle of safety (1), which stakeholders agree is paramount.

While supported, respondents want to better understand how smaller airlines / other airspace users will be impacted

Clarification / extra information

- Some wish to know more about how many air users will be affected by this, in order to better judge the potential impact.
- A minority also need more information to understand what the latest navigational technology actually includes, and what phasing would look like in this context.

Changes to language

- Language is clear, but there are some refinements requested:
- There's scope to make the language stronger – **'will'** or **'must'** would be more powerful than **'should'** in this context.
- There are also calls to define what **'latest aircraft navigational technology'** means here**.**

“Latest aircraft technology – more efficient use of airspace so less emissions and less impact on the environment.”
General Public

“Need to use latest technology – older planes are likely to be in the minority and out of use in the near future.”
Community / Care / Business

“What does aircraft navigational technology mean?”
General Public

“There’s a vast majority of aircraft such as microlites that have not got that technology and it is prohibitive because of cost.”
Elected reps / Aviation

“It is useful to encourage airlines to introduce new technology more quickly.”
General Public

“A good idea but implementation times – cost, practicality?”
Elected reps / Aviation

“Yes – encourage airlines to use newer planes or upgrade.”
Special Interest / Leisure

“Obviously the better technology means that they could fly closer together, or the routes could be closer together, which again might be beneficial.”
Community / Care / Business

“To achieve the best possible routes in relation to emissions, safety and commercial viability.”
Special Interest / Leisure

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 9

Where practical, airspace designs should avoid flying over noise sensitive areas, such as historical attractions, tranquil or rural areas, sites of care or education.

While understood, Design Principle 9 receives the greatest challenge from stakeholders

- **Avoiding noise sensitive areas makes sense, where possible**
  - Stakeholders agree that, in theory, avoiding certain noise sensitive areas makes sense
  - However, across groups they struggle to see how this principle could be applied, given the number of areas that could be implicated
  - Again there is a heavy noise focus here – some want to see the impact of emissions noted here too
- **There are some questions around the implications of this**
  - Some are concerned that this principle could constrain efforts to reduce emissions
  - A minority question whether this will mean built-up areas being more heavily overflown, which could have further implications for noise (esp. at night)
  - Many agree that this should not be implemented to the detriment of other principles
- **There are some calls for clarity around NSAs**
  - While the caveat 'where practical' is important here, some question which noise sensitive areas will be included and how practicability will be assessed.

Draft Design Principle 9

"Where practical, airspace designs should avoid flying over noise sensitive areas, such as historical attractions, tranquil or rural areas, sites of care or education."

Respondents are clear that any application of this principle must be assessed case by case

Is this a logical addition? Does it make sense

While this principle makes sense there is concern that it is impractical – stakeholders agree that avoidance should be judged on a case by case basis, but ultimately identification of noise sensitive areas could be greatly subjective.

Draft Design Principle 9

"Where practical, airspace designs should avoid flying over noise sensitive areas, such as historical attractions, tranquil or rural areas, sites of care or education."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

This principle fits with previous conversations (question 9), especially the caveat 'where practical', which mirrors concerns voiced previously about the challenges involved in avoiding NSA's entirely.

More information about which areas will be considered is needed in order to judge this principle

Clarification / extra information

- Many are keen to have some details about potential NSAs in order to make decisions (though they realise this will be explored in the consultation at stage 3).
- Height and times of day are important factors here and respondents want to know that they will be considered when it comes to assessing the impact of overflying on NSA's.

Changes to language

- While the language is generally clear / understood, some refinement is needed:
- **'Noise sensitive areas'** need to be clearly defined for ease.

"The principle is unarguable, of course, but I'm not sure how that works in reality." **General Public**	*"So, you're saying you're going to avoid those areas, are you then going to be sending more over the built-up, busy and housing areas rather than care or education?"* **Community / Care / Business**	*"This depends on personal preference."* **General Public**
"Agree, but the question is who?" **Elected reps / Aviation**	*"This is not that important."* **General Public**	*"How feasible is this in urban areas? What is people's perception of noise? Will they do research?"* **Elected reps / Aviation**
"Agree with this principle, but what does this mean – rural?" **Special Interest / Leisure**	*"How do you define a noise sensitive area?"* **Community / Care / Business**	*"Where possible, but agree this is not a practical resolution."* **Special Interest / Leisure**

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

THE FUTURE OF AIRSPACE
DESIGN PRINCIPLE 10

Designs should seek to minimise, and where possible, reduce, the effect of noise from flights upon people.

Design Principle 10 shows consideration, however some question how much difference it will make in reality

- **The overall aim is understood and supported by many**
  - This is seen as a laudable aim by most, who agree that noise is a key challenge for those living under flight paths
  - Given that more demand and better use of capacity may mean more flights, many wonder how this can be achieved in practice
  - This is especially a challenge for communities at the end of the runways, who are most heavily affected by noise (esp. during take-off)
- **Stakeholders have mixed views on the implications**
  - Some question what the impact of this would be on reducing emissions – as it seems like a trade-off, that conflicts with Principle 5
  - Given the strength of feeling towards environmental impact across groups, there is a need to show how noise and emissions can be balanced here
- **Some have questions around the content**
  - Many say the issue is more nuanced than it's presented
  - They want more detail on what other factors will be considered – time of overflying and whether areas are rural / urban are key when assessing impact

Draft Design Principle 10
"Designs should seek to minimise, and where possible, reduce, the effect of noise from flights upon people."

Respondents say this principle is clearly related to earlier conversations – noise was a contentious topic across groups

Is this a logical addition? Does it make sense

Overall the inclusion of this principle makes sense and it is seen as something to aim for (esp. for those living under flight paths), however, some remain sceptical of whether noise can be substantially reduced in practice.

Draft Design Principle 10
"Designs should seek to minimise, and where possible, reduce, the effect of noise from flights upon people."

Does it fit with earlier conversations?

It is clear to all stakeholders that consideration for the impact on noise upon people has come from previous conversations – it was a key issue raised numerous times in the focus groups, and it's a key concern for many.

Reassurance is needed that this principle will be balanced against others when it comes to emissions

Clarification / extra information

- Many call for reassurance that this principle will be considered in balance with emissions.
- Additional information around how this would be applied to night vs. daytime flights and flying over areas of low vs. high ambient noise is also needed.

Changes to language

- Small changes to language are requested here:
- Stronger language is required: **‘will’** rather than **‘should’** would be stronger, and show that MAN is taking accountability.
- Some also question the use of **‘where possible’** here, and ask for this to be clarified
- A minority say the statement should not be to reduce **‘the effects of noise’** but to reduce / eliminate the noise itself.

"Emissions are more concerning than noise" **General Public**	*"How? Planes are quieter, but if there are more planes, there is more noise"* **Community / Care / Business**	*"Agree – but it should say 'must'"* **General Public**
"Sensible idea, but people in rural areas are affected just as much or more than densely populated areas" **Elected reps / Aviation**	*"Effect of noise is an issue – e.g. lack of sleep"* **General Public**	*"Clearly yes, but the impact seems unavoidable in some areas"* **Elected reps / Aviation**
"Why only considering noise, what about emissions?" **Special Interest / Leisure**	*"Noise is an important concern – it needs to be minimised for people's wellbeing"* **Community / Care / Business**	*"What does 'where possible' mean?"* **Special Interest / Leisure**

YouGov®

N.B. All responses taken from self-complete forms completed during the sessions.

Final thoughts

Final thoughts

1. Stakeholders broadly understand the inclusion of each of the design principles in the short-list – however, some say that numbering each principle suggests priority ordering.
2. Most agree that the principles reflect earlier conversations, and where they don't (i.e. 'making best use of the runways', which wasn't discussed explicitly), they can understand the rationale for inclusion.
3. While principles are generally understood, there are calls for content to be clarified / honed in places (e.g. offering definitions of 'emissions'), to ensure greater cut through.
4. While language is generally clear, there are some points of confusion. Design Principle 2 is too complex / complicated to understand without support, so plain English is required.
5. Many call for greater uniformity in terms of language and tone: language / tone in principles 1-3 is felt to be stronger / more direct than in other principles, and there's a desire to see this applied throughout.

Thursday 31st October 2019

Manchester Airport: Future Airspace Research – Workshops

[redacted] – Director, Head of Qualitative Research
[redacted] – Senior Research Executive, Qualitative Research

YouGov®